

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

BOYD FULTON,
Plaintiff

v.

TOWN OF HULL, MASSACHUSETTS,
Defendant

Civil Action No.2004 CV 11234
MEL

**PLAINTIFF'S ASSENTED TO MOTION
TO FILE RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO ATTORNEY'S FEES**

The Plaintiff respectfully requests this Court allow the Plaintiff two weeks to file a brief Reply Memorandum to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Consolidated Motion for Assessment of Costs Including Reasonable Attorney's Fees. As reasons the Plaintiff says that the Reply is required to respond to several interpretations of precedent cited by the Defendant and/or to correct several mis-characterized statements of fact not addressed in Plaintiff's Memorandum in chief. The two weeks are required because:

1. Plaintiff's Counsel has a Brief due at the Supreme Judicial Court in the same time period; and
2. Plaintiff's Counsel, Mark D. Stern, and his law student clerk are each on a short holiday break with their respective families during the early part of July.

By his attorney,

Mark D. Stern/s

Mark D. Stern
BBO #479500
Mark D. Stern, P.C.
34 Liberty Avenue
Somerville, MA 02144
Tel. (617) 776-4020
Fax (617) 776-9250
email: markdsterncpc@rcn.com

Assented to:

James B. Lampke/s

James B. Lampke